

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chee* (US 5,694,141). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 24 and 31) recites a step of "in response to a selection of a concurrent display mode, providing identical information to said first and second memory locations, such that contents displayed on said first display device are identical to contents displayed on said second display device," and a step of "in response to a selection of a split display mode, retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location, such that contents displayed on said first display device are different from contents displayed on said second display device." Thus, the claimed invention allows identical contents to be simultaneously displayed on a first and second display devices under the concurrent display mode, and different contents to be simultaneously displayed on the first display device and the second display device under the split display mode.

The Examiner asserts that the two claimed steps are taught by *Chee*. Specifically, on page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts the displaying of different contents on two display devices is disclosed by *Chee* in col. 17, lines 45-54. On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner also asserts the displaying of identical contents on two display devices is disclosed by *Chee* in col. 5, lines 24-25.

In col. 5, lines 24-25, *Chee* does mention that "both display devices [in the '109 patent] will show the same image." But *Chee* continues to mention that the "'109 patent is not believed to relate to the driving of two display devices simultaneously, with each display device showing a different image" (col. 5, lines 25-27). Thus, the '109 patent teaches the displaying of identical contents on two display devices but not the displaying of different contents on the same two

display devices. On the other hand, in col. 17, lines 45-54, *Chee* does teach the displaying of different contents on two display devices, but *Chee* does not teach or suggest the displaying of identical contents on the same two display devices.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner responds to the Applicants' previous arguments (which is similar to the above-stated position) by saying "the [Applicants'] discussion is related to the prior art." Then, the Examiner provides another specific location in *Chee* (i.e., col. 5, lines 57-59) to support his position that *Chee* teaches the displaying of identical contents on two display devices. It is not clear what the Examiner's point of "the [Applicants'] discussion is related to the prior art" means because it is exactly the Applicants' position—the displaying of identical contents on two display devices is only taught by the '109 patent (i.e., the prior art) but not taught by *Chee*. As such, the '109 patent's teaching of displaying identical contents on two display devices cannot be combined with *Chee*'s teaching of displaying different contents on two display devices without any motivation or suggestion from one of the references for the purpose of the § 103 rejection.

In fact, the additional citation (i.e., col. 5, lines 57-59) given by the Examiner states that *Chee*'s "invention is to provide a video display controller allow two displays to be driven simultaneously, with each display having a different image" (emphasis added). Thus, the additional citation actually supports Applicants' position of *Chee* only teaches the displaying of different contents on two display devices, and not the Examiner's position of *Chee* also teaches the displaying of identical contents on two display devices.

Furthermore, with respect to the Examiner's assertion that the claimed retaining step is disclosed by *Chee* in col. 17, lines 45-54; even though in col. 17, lines 45-54, *Chee* teaches that different images can be presented on different displays simultaneously, but *Chee* does not teach or suggest that the information in the first memory location are retained and the information in the second memory location are updated, as claimed. Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested in *Chee*, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 24 and 31 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. 50-3533.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS